Minutes of

Meeting

**CALL TO ORDER:** Mayor Williams called the Riverside, Ohio City Council Work Session to order at 6:00 p.m. at the Riverside Administrative Offices located at 5200 Springfield Street, Suite 100, Riverside, Ohio, 45431.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: Mayor Williams led the pledge of allegiance.

**ROLL CALL:** Council attendance was as follows: Ms. Campbell, present; Mr. Denning, present; Mrs. Franklin, present; Ms. Fry, present; Deputy Mayor Lommatzsch, present; Mr. Teaford, present; and Mayor Williams, present.

Staff present was as follows: Mark Carpenter, City Manager; Tom Garrett, Finance Director; Kathy Bartlett, Public Service Director; Gary Burkholder, Community Development Director; and Katie Lewallen, Clerk of Council.

**EXCUSE ABSENT MEMBERS:** No council members were absent.

**ADDITIONS OR CORRECTIONS TO AGENDA:** There were no additions or corrections to the amended agenda.

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA:** Mrs. Franklin motioned to approve the agenda. Mr. Denning seconded the motion. All were in favor; none opposed. **Motion carried.** 

#### **WORK SESSION ITEMS:**

**Grant Applications** – Ms. Kathy Bartlett stated they are early in the 2021 grant applications since it was April. The first grant application isn't due until August. They need to start early to do all the research needed to give them the best chances of getting the grants. She provided a couple of maps showing projects the city has funding for over the next five years. She stated there are four types of grants: Ohio Public Works Commission (OPWC), Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP), Surface Transportation Program (STP), and STP Resurfacing.

Ms. Bartlett stated she wants to submit two OPWC applications. Both projects already have some funding. The first is the US 35/Woodman Interchange; the city portion is \$690,000. When they put together an OPWC application, they will probably request another 50 - 100%, and depending on the numbers it would be a 0% loan. That would take care of most of the \$690,000. The second one is the Olentangy Drive Bridge. They received municipal bridge funds through ODOT that will pay for everything but \$160,000, roughly. They would request anywhere from a 50%-100% grant to a 50%-100% loan. They will only gain in applying for these grants. She provided a map of the two projects showing their location in the city. She added there is another OPWC grant they could apply for with water. It is the Beverly Gardens cluster: portions of Lawver Lane, Barret Drive, Trunk Drive, and Travis Drive. The cost is not yet determined; it may be around \$500,000. The grant would likely pay 30%-50% of that. This is a project that Montgomery County Environmental Services would lead; they would put the application together, but there would be cost to the city in that ChoiceOne would have to prepare an engineer's estimate to go along with the application.

There are two projects for the HSIP applications. They were both submitted last year in some form. They know how to better submit for this year. Both grants would be 90% funded by ODOT with a 10% local match. The first project is Harshman/Route 4 on ramp and two other guardrail related projects on State Route 202. All the accidents that occur at the top of the ramp leaves damaged guardrail that they are constantly replacing especially in winter. It would provide high-friction surface treatment asphalt and allow the city to move the guard rail away from the ramp a bit so if someone ran off the road they may not hit the guardrail. On SR 202, there are two culverts that are not properly covered by guardrails for safety conditions so they would add guardrail in both locations. That application is not due until July with funding for that in 2022-23. The local match would not exceed \$50,000. This is an abbreviated application and cannot exceed \$500,000. The second project is the Harshman/Valley and Harshman/Beatrice intersections. This is a high accident location like

Minutes of Meeting

Airway/Woodman. This application is due in September for funding in 2026. The local match would be \$200,000. They can also apply for OPWC and that would bring the \$200,000 down depending on how they strategize to get the most points.

The STP Resurfacing grant is not available every year. They received it two years ago for Spinning Road from Linden to Eastman. Funds are strictly for resurfacing projects; repairs like curb replacement is up to the local municipality. She would like to submit on Valley Street west of Harshman Road from Valley to City of Dayton Corp. line. Before the project is done, she would like to take out the island and make it one smooth pavement. That would look best as she doesn't see them using the island again. Funds are available in 2023. MVRPC received additional funding due to the latest round of COVID-19 money so they are 100% funding the project whereas normally it is an 80%/20% split. Because it is 100% funded, they may want to consider other projects. One of those possibly could be Spinning Road from Eastman to Burkhardt. The city would pay for the curb replacement, which is around \$100,000. The resurfacing fund limit is \$400,000. They may be over by about \$50,000, but Choice One would do a more accurate estimate in doing the application. Going through STP funding, they would be eligible for OPWC funds at a later date. Both Valley and Spinning would have to be completed by December 31, 2024.

The plan for the STP Application was to submit this year for Woodman Drive (Phase 4A – Airway to Springfield). Next year, they would submit for Phase 4B; however, there was a conversation last week with MVRPC and ODOT. They looked at Phase 4B as a maintenance project as they weren't adding any bike lanes or doing anything like that. They will probably not get a \$3.0 million grant like they would for Phase 4A. It may make sense to do the whole thing with only getting a \$3.0 million grant. She plans to come back in June/July with some different funding packages to get this section of roadway constructed. They are waiting for the wall inspection report, which she does not believe will be good just from communication she received while doing the inspection. There is also a feasibility study being done on Phases 4A and 4B. They also need more discussion with MVRPC and ODOT to learn more about an alternate funding package.

Ms. Campbell stated that removing the island on Valley Street would be favorable to others as well who have commented they want it gone. The island goes against driver expectancy; no one is expecting something to be in the middle of the road like that. If a sign goes back in there, it needs to go to the side of the road. Ms. Campbell stated when people who live there pull out of their driveway they have to turn toward Dayton and turn around to come back; they have to go the opposite direction.

Mr. Teaford asked if the project on Eastman coordinates with what they are doing up there putting in new lanes. Ms. Bartlett stated that was a joint application like Beverly Gardens where the county took the lead and the city shared in the grant money. They will come in and pave Eastman after the county gets finished. Mr. Teaford asked is that was when they would have curb and sidewalks put in. Ms. Bartlett confirmed that was correct.

Mrs. Franklin asked when they are talking about estimates for projects, how do they calculate them out 4-5 years for expenses. Ms. Bartlett replied is that she uses a high estimate. For example, on Valley Street, her estimate was \$500,000; Jay came in at \$350,000 so there is a lot of play in the estimates. This is just to determine if they want to move forward with projects. Choice One does the actual estimate because they have access to actual bidding costs and can project for future years. It is a gamble because asphalt can come in very high for no reason; it is not a linear thing. Mrs. Franklin asked if they are looking at Choice One, then their estimate doesn't come in until they being the project. Ms. Bartlett replied it is for the application. Mrs. Franklin asked when they submit the application then it will have the Choice One estimate. Ms. Bartlett stated that was correct. Mrs. Franklin asked when they are looking at the roads are they looking at the design or are they just concerned about getting the pavement done. Are they looking at pedestrian use, bikes, ADA ramps, landscaping or are they getting input from residents and businesses that the roads affect? Ms. Bartlett stated

Minutes of Meeting

Held	Thursday, April 8, 2021	20

FAR GRAPHICS 800-325-8094 FORM NO 10148

there are certain stipulations with the grant. The STP resurfacing grant requires all ADA ramps compliant before applying. On Valley Street west, there are two ADA ramps that need replaced and they would have to do that before October before they can submit and application. The same is true on Spinning Road. There is money in the budget as a few projects have come in under budget, about \$10,000 so she can get those ramps replaced. Resurfacing is strictly that; asphalt down with a requirement that the ADA ramps have to be up to code. When it is STP projects like 35 to Eastman, the reason they got it funded is because they are adding a bikeway to one side. The STP application they plan to go for on 4A section of Woodman that also has a bike path starting at Airway and going up the west side and then going on to the local streets winding its way to Springfield. They do look at any time they can put a bikeway in they do. Many times, it involves getting outside the rightof-way and certain projects do not allow the purchase of right-of-way or it would not fit in the time frame they need to use the money. Mrs. Franklin stated her concern is that while the road is nicer and better to move on, but maybe the design wasn't as nice; she wondered when doing a project are they looking for input from people who use the road. She understands she must look at it with an engineering standpoint. Mrs. Franklin stated if they don't use it every day, they don't see the limitations or what is positive or negative. Ms. Bartlett stated that she has requested for a few years in the budget to develop a bikeway master plan. They would hire a consultant to look at the streets and have public input meetings and develop a network within Riverside that allows them to know when putting in a roadway, what can they do to make it part of the plan. On Spinning from Linden to Eastman, there was discussion about the need for a bikeway. That project was made possible with STP resurfacing funds, and they can't go outside the right-of-way with that. The only way to get a bike path would have been to go outside the right-of-way. Discussion continued on how to incorporate items into a project. Ms. Bartlett stated when it involves right-of-way, it is a much bigger situation as there are environmental issues, public information, etc... and this adds a year to the project. Mrs. Franklin asked if on Spinning from Linden to Eastman they would not finish the sidewalks because of this. Ms. Bartlett confirmed that was correct.

Mr. Carpenter stated there are a lot of projects in the works that require matches. They are getting close to beyond his comfort level on matches. A lot of those will start coming due in 2023-24 so they have to take a look at paying down some of the capital debt or using cash to pay some of the match before they take on bigger and bigger projects. They do not know all the rules with the additional Rescue Funding how that will allow them to do some work or if they can use it to pay some of the capital debt. Mrs. Franklin asked what the average of paying off a project. Mr. Carpenter replied they take it for the life of the road. For example, East Springfield, they took a 23-year loan. He added that OPWC are interest free loans. They have to get additional financing where interest is involved. He is concerned about the total amount of capital debt. Ms. Fry stated it is a concern when they can't pass a levy to help pay those debts off. Mr. Carpenter stated that payment-wise it is in their ballpark, it is just carrying the debt. Ms. Fry added that when the life of the road is finished, they have zero dollars in the bank to pay to start the cycle over. She stated there was a slide stating they were putting in more applications and he is saying they need to be mindful of how much match they are committing. How is the decision on which applications they put in being made? Mr. Carpenter stated that before they had room to take on some debt, but with these projects coming up like Lynnhaven and Meyer, they need to borrow \$1.0 million. Ms. Fry asked if this was just informative or if there is a question for council. Mr. Carpenter stated it is just informative thus far. When there is a better idea of cost and how to fund, then they will bring it to council. Deputy Mayor Lommatzsch stated that it would be June or July before things are brought to them. The amount of work that has gone into this is mind boggling and she admires Ms. Bartlett for the work she is done. They are not alone as this is how things get done; all municipalities use the same mechanisms.

Discussion was held on the future projects and how prioritization would be handled. Mr. Carpenter stated they have been aggressive in infrastructure and these are more opportunities they wanted council to be aware of. Mr. Denning stated with the infrastructure bill they may end up with more possibilities in the future. He is thankful for the work Ms. Bartlett has done

Minutes of Meeting

### Held Thursday, April 8, 2021 20

and looking out five years and more to put projects on the books to plan budgets is amazing. They need to be able to look far enough ahead and not fall back to how they were before. He asked if there were places in the city that they could use TIF money for any of the matching part. Mr. Carpenter replied they hadn't identified that, but they have thought of creating additional TIFs that would benefit them in the future. Mr. Denning stated they had \$100,000 in curbs and asked if they planned on assessing that to the property owners. Mr. Carpenter stated that still needs to be determined. Mr. Denning stated that if a grant covers 80% of that then they would assess only the 20% to the property owner, but if the grant on the road did not cover any of that, then whatever % the grant covered, the remainder would be the property owner's responsibility. He is aware the city has to pay it upfront. Mr. Carpenter stated they created the formula last year depending on the cost and how many years.

Ms. Fry asked if at a later time they will come back to council with a final list of projects. Mr. Carpenter replied they would. Discussion was held on the grants being presented that would give more accurate numbers and then they would decide how to move forward. Ms. Bartlett stated she would come back in June or July on the STP application as she doesn't have enough information on that right now. On the other grants, she could present again, but she was hoping if council was okay with the projects she named that it would be up to the city manager to determine if they could afford it and the next time it would come forward is with a resolution to go for the grant. Ms. Fry stated if any of them they determine they can't afford that would be helpful information.

Mr. Carpenter asked Ms. Bartlett to pull up the north and south maps to show council all the things that are in the works from now to a few years in the future. He added she has done a great job on getting the projects going and staying on track.

1) Honeyleaf Drive - Ms. Bartlett stated there has been discussion on adding Honeyleaf Drive to the paving program this year. It was in the 2020 program, but when COVID-19 hit, it was cut from the budget. She has received numerous calls on this roadway that is beyond patching, especially near the top of the hill. There is base failure; the curb has slipped away. Without the curb it is not getting proper drainage and making the road worse. Last year's bid on the project was \$400,000. She stated her and Mr. Carpenter have talked about possible COVID-19 money to fund the project. They could add it to the program and name it as an alternate meaning the contractor could bid on it; they would have until early June to decide if they want it part of the contract. Mr. Carpenter added that the reason they could move forward this year would be if the money was available and the design work has already been completed. Mr. Denning stated that is a great idea, especially if other projects come in under budget. They would already know the hard number they need to work with unlike when they were forced to do Airway and only had a ballpark number and it went up by almost 50%, but still had to get it done. He stated they should go forward with it as an alternate. Mr. Carpenter stated he recommends they do it.

2) Department Staffing – Ms. Bartlett presented a table of organization for her department. She budgeted adding a part-time administrative assistant. She reviewed the duties of an administrative assistant. These are things Ms. Rice has been doing for her, and she is set to retire at the end of May 2021. With all the projects they have, 30 active right now, anything from payroll to permits to accounts payable where they have 40 invoices biweekly and another 20 invoices for consultants, there are things not getting done by having somebody at the front desk do this. She needs someone good at Word and letter writing, mail merging and that type of thing. She could keep a part-time person busy. Work orders would still come in through the front desk as she does not feel it to be good for the public image of the city to have people calling in and getting bounced to another person who is only working part-time. This person would also not make park reservation. The position would be up to 30 hours dedicated to public services. She stated they currently have six maintenance workers and two operators. She wants to take two maintenance workers and make them park technicians and two maintenance workers and make them inspectors. Park technicians have

Minutes of Meeting

	TI 1 A 110 2021	
Held	Thursday, April 8, 2021	20

AR GRAPHICS 800-325-8094 FORM NO 10148

two tests to pass: a pesticide test and a playground inspection test. They would have to pass both tests before getting a bump in their hourly rate of .70/hour. Inspectors have class work and spend time with Jay out in the field. She wants this to happen so she has guys who know more than the average and give them incentive to want to learn more. All these positions are in the budget. Mr. Carpenter stated they would need to bring a revised table of organization to council to add the position. Discussion was held on the department previously having an admin position. Certain departments need to have their own admin person.

Revenue Update – Mr. Carpenter stated they had a pretty good month in March; they are actually ahead on their budget, and ahead of last year's budget. The total is close to \$250,000. He presented the tracking since adjustments were made last year. Over the last 10 months they have averaged \$1,079,820/month in revenue. The target for 2021 was \$1,007,310/month. Things seem to be pointed upwards. They are currently on track.

Budget Committee – Mr. Carpenter stated last week he gave them a rough draft on establishing a budget committee. The objectives would be to create more community involvement, keep connecting with the community, increase transparency, allow for more citizen input and comment on how they see the city spend the money, and exchange ideas to better identify priorities. He reviewed the codified ordinances that discussed establishing committees and commissions. He reviewed other cities budget committees and members. Some cities allow for one member per voting district while others allow for two. He is concerned with filling all those positions and the attendance. If two per precinct, then if one can't come the other may be able to represent. Terms would be four years that would begin in a staggered format. He discussed if it would members of the public alone or did some of council wish to participate. Staff would also have some representation to address questions and provide information. Membership is honorary and no compensation is provided; only expenses are allowed for in the code. He reviewed the outline of the organization: chairperson, vice-chair person, clerk, and alternate clerk. They would adopt rules and regulations on how they conduct business and make sure not to conflict with codes or state law. He reviewed the purpose of the group to look at the previous year budget and communicate to the residents in their precinct. They would share what type of services they would like to see from the city. They would discuss budget issues and review the overall financial needs of the city based on the estimated revenue. He added they operate in an advisory capacity and council has final say on the budget.

Ms. Fry stated one of the big pieces they want to fill is the advisory piece on whether they do need to ask the citizens for more revenue, which is implied on the slide, but not on the document. It only has a written report for the budget, but it doesn't say the committee would give any advice on revenue. She feels that is a hole. Mr. Carpenter replied that is a draft and it can be revised. It is not the final version. He reviewed the powers and duties of the budget committee. They would create a document of recommendation shared with the city manager and council. Official minutes would be kept and adhere to all the open meeting laws.

Ms. Campbell asked if this committee would try to take over and have control over everything. Mr. Carpenter replied this committee would not have the authority to do that. Mayor Williams added it is like the Charter Review Commission where they can offer advice and new ways to structure and city council decides to pursue or not pursue those. Deputy Mayor Lommatzsch stated that September 30 may be a little late in the planning process. He may wish to consider the end of August. She thinks by September 30 they will have a sense of where they are going and waiting for their recommendation by then may be late. Discussion was held on a more updated time line. Mr. Denning stated he would like to see this group come up with a long-term 5-year plan of revenue and resources and some suggestions to council on what they can do to increase revenue, not just year-to-year. Ms. Fry recommended that whatever they pass would include all the things council hopes to get from them rather than things they hope they will offer - deliverables on an annual basis. Mr. Denning stated they need to be specific in telling them what they want. Ms. Fry suggested they have a primary and alternate for each district rather than having two delegates; the

Minutes of Meeting

person who is primary feels the responsibility and if unavailable can make sure the alternate attends. Mr. Denning stated one vote per district is better for the community. Mr. Carpenter stated they have 14 precincts as Page Manor can vote. Discussion was held on the number of members and attendance concerns. Mr. Denning stated there is nothing that says that one of them can't be on the committee representing their precinct. Ms. Fry said there is. Discussion was held on council members being able to be on the committee should no one in their precinct wish to be on the committee. Mayor Williams stated the big picture of this committee is to give the public ability to have more input and allow for more transparency. If a person has ideas on how they should focus the money they should apply to be on the committee, and they will have a voice at the table and hear directly from staff on what things cost and how they are paid for. This is where he wants this opportunity to go. Ms. Campbell stated that a lot people will assume that something is right and tell them this is what they can do when they can't. Mr. Carpenter stated this is where they can provide information on why things are done the way they are or what prevents something from being done. Ms. Lewallen stated that the charter indicates in Section 9.02 (4) indicates that except as otherwise provided in the charter members of a board or commission shall not hold any elected office in the city. This new commission would not have been a part of the charter and council members should not sit on this. They would have to be a non-voting member. Mr. Carpenter stated he would clean up the document a bit and ask some questions to provide feedback from council and maybe one more work session to get to a final version. Mr. Denning stated they would have to get a letter of appointment from council, so hopefully, by the time they get to the final version they would have a list of volunteers ready to jump on board. He does not want this to drag out and have to spend three months trying to get people to volunteer where if they start now they would have a list. Mr. Carpenter stated he was thinking of putting it on social media and then possibly a postcard or newsletter. Mayor Williams stated they need to move forward letting people know the committee will be formed soon and would like to get an idea of who is interested.

**COUNCIL MEMBER COMMENTS:** Mrs. Franklin thanked Ms. Bartlett for the hard work in putting grant information together. She also cautioned people to be aware that kids are out playing and slow down. Ms. Campbell stated they need to push the curfew more as kids are out late and lots of cars are being broken into. Deputy Mayor Lommatzsch asked people to pay attention to stop signs; rolling stops don't get it at a stop sign especially with kids crossing and bicycles. She sees so many people blow through stop signs like they don't exist. That is how people get hurt. Mr. Denning stated the Jaycee's Easter egg hunt was well attended, 300+ kids and everyone wore their masks as they were supposed to. He was glad to see some normalcy back in the community. He thanked the fire department for bringing the Easter bunny.

ADJOURNMENT: Ms. Campbell motioned to adjourn. Mr. Denning seconded the motion. All were in favor; none were opposed. Motion carried. The meeting adjourned at 7:19 pm.

Peter J. Williams, Mayor

Clerk of Council